



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,073	06/07/2002	Theodorus Lambertus Hoeks	08CS5682-1	3895
23413	7590	05/03/2005	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			RAJGURU, UMAKANT K	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1711		

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/064,073	HOEKS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Umakant K. Rajguru	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

1. A response (to the second non-final rejection of December 1, 2004) has been filed January 31, 2005.
2. Claims under examination are 1-22.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomas (US 4,404,303).
5. Claims 1, 16, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303).
6. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ishihara (US 4,735,978).
7. Claims 17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303) as applied to claims 16, 19 and 21 (as appropriate) above, and further in view of Ishihara (US 4,735,978).
8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303) in view of Ishihara (US 4,735,978) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boyd et al (US 6,518,347).
9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303) in view of Ishihara (US 4,735,978) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chiba et al (US 6,174,944).

Art Unit: ~~1734~~ 1711

10. Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (US 4,404,303) in view of Ishihara (US 4,735,978) as applied to claim 1 and 16 (as appropriate), and further in view of McElveen (US 4,154,692).

Please refer to items 5 and 7-13 of prior Office action of December 1, 2004 for these rejections.

11. Applicant's arguments filed January 31, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' main argument against the above rejections is that "spraying an aqueous solution of a fire retardant on dry polycarbonate is distinctly different from compounding". This argument is not persuasive since "compounding" means "mixing, blending or combining". It is therefore immaterial whether such a mixing is brought about by spraying a solution onto dry particles or by just bringing together the solution and dry particles. The ultimate product the same.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: ~~1734~~ 1711

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to U.K. Rajguru whose telephone number is (571) 272-1077. The examiner can generally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 am-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



U.K. Rajguru/dh
April 14, 2005



James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700